(SRI H. V. KOUJALGI)

at the rates permissible under B.T. and A.L. Act, Government is not aware of any harassment.

(*g*) Does not arise in view of item (*f*) above.

(*h*) The lands vested in Government and still remaining to be granted on account of non-payment of occupancy price by below the line kabjedars before 26th January 1969 are to be disposed of according to the New Land Grant Rules. Other vested lands in respect of which occupancy price has been paid are being disposed of according to law.

Mr. SPEAKER.—There are no supplementaries. Then next question No. 462.

Appeals against enhancement of Compensation in Acquisition Cases of Mangalore Harbour

462. Sri P. V. AITHALA (Suratkal.)—

Will the Minister for Law, Labour and Parliamentary Affairs be pleased to state:—

(*a*) the number of applications under Section 18 of the Land Acquisition Act decided by the II-Additional Civil Judge of Mangalore, South Kanara relating to the acquisition of land for the Mangalore Harbour Project in which enhancement of compensation has been ordered by the said Court in 1968 and 1969 up to the latest convenient date ;

(*b*) of the cases referred to in (*a*) above, in how many the State preferred appeals against the enhancement and the number of cases in which appeals were not preferred against the enhancement ;

(*c*) the number of appeals filed against the orders for the grant of enhanced compensation where the quantum of enhancement granted is less than (i) Rs. 1,000 and (ii) Rs. 500 ;

(*d*) whether it is a fact that in every case in which the said Civil Court ordered enhancement of compensation under section 18, the Special Deputy Commissioner (Harbour and Railways), Mangalore has been recommending to the Government to prefer appeals irrespective of whether the amount of compensation enhanced is a few hundred Rupees ;

(*e*) whether it is the policy of the Government to prefer appeals against all cases of enhancement irrespective of the amount involved ?

Sri K. PUTTASWAMY (Minister for Law, Labour and Parliamentary Affairs.)—

(a) *1968* *1969 (Up to the end of 1969)*
85 77

(b)—

	Year	No. in which appeals preferred.	No. in which appeals were not preferred
(i)	1968	80	5
(ii)	1969	65	12

(c)—

	Year	No. of appeals preferred where quantum of enhanced compensation is less than Rs. 1,000.	No. of appeals preferred where quantum of compensation is less than Rs. 500.
(i)	1968	Nil	9
(ii)	1969	1	5

(d) No.

(e) No. Appeals are preferred only in such cases where the quantum of enhancement of compensation awarded by courts is considered to be opposed to law, facts and probabilities of the case.

Sri P. V. AITHALA.—We find from the statement given that out of 80 cases decided in 1968 appeals were not filed in 5 cases only whereas in 1969 against 65 cases appeals were not filed only in 12 cases. Were the appeals not filed because they could not be filed within the time limit prescribed by law ?

Sri K. PUTTASWAMY.— That may not be correct.

Sri P. V. AITHALA.—Is it just and equitable that appeals should be filed even in cases where the court has granted enhancement to the extent of less than Rs. 500, especially when the acquisition is under the Land Acquisition Act which is an expropriation Act ?

Sri K. PUTTASWAMY.—It all depends on the extent of land involved. Even though the extent of land is small, on account of the increase being considered rather not enough, appeals are preferred.

Sri K. H. RANGANATH.—May I know the time consumed for the decision in respect of 80 cases in 1968 and in respect of 65 cases in 1968 ?

Sri K. PUTTASWAMY.—I am not able to give that information.

Sri P. V. AITHALA.—May I know whether the Law Department is scrutinising every recommendation that is received from the Special Deputy Commissioner before according sanction or whether it is an administrative sanction that is being simply given by the Law Department ?

Sri K. PUTTASWAMY.—After the Law Department goes through the judgment and considers it, decision is taken whether to prefer an appeal or not.

3-00 P.M.

Beating of a Municipal Councillor and M. E. S. Worker in Belgaum

478. Sri B. B. SAYANAK (Belgaum).—

Will the Chief Minister be pleased to state :—

(*a*) whether it is a fact that 1st November 1969 was observed by the Maharashtra Ekikaran Samiti as a black and hartal day in Belgaum City ;

(*b*) whether it is a fact that on 1st November 1969 the Police beat Sri R. S. Mane, Municipal Councillor, by entering the house of Sri Kulhalli in Kelkar Bag in Belgaum City (House No. 1787) ;

c) whether it is a fact that one Rama Huvappa Shindolker a worker of M. E. Samiti was intentionally beaten by the Assistant Superintendent of Police and Sri Gunji, Sub-Inspector, along with 10-15 police force ;

(*d*) whether it is a fact that Sri Hegde, Additional S. P. had taken him to his house ?

A.—Sri VEERENDRA PATIL (Chief Minister).—

(*a*) Yes.

(*b*) No.

(*c*) No.

(*d*) No.

Sri B. B. SAYANAK.—May I know whether the Government is aware that Sri R. S. Mane, Municipal Councillor, was beaten by the Police by entering the house of Sri Kulhalli in Kelkar Bag in Belgaum City, bearing House No. 1787 ? Was not this case published in Marathi Daily ?